



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Handwritten mark resembling a stylized 'n' or 'u'.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/535,154	03/24/2000	Eric Metois	SOL-148	1884

7590

01/13/2005

Barry R Lipsitz
Law Offices Of Barry R Lipsitz
755 Main Street Building 8
Monroe, CT 06468

EXAMINER

AKPATI, ODAICHE T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2135

DATE MAILED: 01/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/535,154	METOIS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tracey Akpati	2135	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the corresponding address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 July 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 March 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-23 are pending. None of the claims have been amended. The attorney argues over the given claims. These arguments are rebutted as shown below. This action is final.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 7/6/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

2. *With respect to Claim 1 and 22 limitation, the attorney argues that the signature does not meet the definition of a steganographic/watermark signal.* The attorney is reminded that the rejection is a 103 obviousness rejection. The signature represents the watermark signal in functionality, in light of the claimed limitation. The signature is used the same way as described in the claimed limitation. The degree of deterioration of the signal is evaluated by measuring the deterioration of the signature (watermark) after the signal undergoes processing (such as replication in Efron, column 7, lines 38-48). Hence, Efron sufficiently meets the claimed limitation.

3. The attorney further argues that "measuring deterioration of the embedded watermark in the steganographic signal after the steganographic signal undergoes processing; estimating the nature and/or amount of processing based on the measured deterioration of the watermark" is not met by Efron. The attorney is further referred to Efron, column 8, lines 16-19, 53-57. Hence after processing, the degradation/deterioration of the signature (watermark) is evaluated/measured.

Art Unit: 2135

4. Further arguments have already been traversed in the previous rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8, 11-20, 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Efron et al (4,755,884).

With regards to Claim 1, Efron meets the limitation “embedding a watermark with a degree of redundancy into the signal to form a steganographic signal” on column 7, lines 57-66; and “measuring a deterioration of the embedded watermark in the steganographic signal after the steganographic signal undergoes the processing” on column 8, lines 20-57, column 7, lines 17-25; and “estimating the nature and/or the amount of the processing based on the measured deterioration” on column 15, lines 33-44. Efron does not explicitly disclose a watermark but instead discloses a signature, which performs the same functions as the watermark with respect to the applicant’s invention.

The signature of the reference represents a watermark because of the reasons also set forth above; and it is stored within a signal that undergoes processing, after which the amount of processing is determined by the evaluation of the embedded signature. It would have been obvious to deduce from Efron’s disclosure that the signature is a type of watermark that forms a

Art Unit: 2135

steganographic signal because the signature is used for the same purpose as a watermark, which is the detection and evaluation of deterioration of quality of a processed signal. Hence this can be applied in copy protection, whereby quality deterioration evaluation is necessary and very useful.

With respect to Claim 2, Efron meets the limitation “said estimating step estimates an intrinsic fragility of the watermark by analyzing characteristics of the steganographic signal” on column 8, lines 7-19, column 7, lines 17-25 and on column 9, lines 5-10.

With respect to Claim 3, Efron meets the limitation “controlling an output of the steganographic signal when the amount of the estimated processing exceeds a threshold level, or the nature of the estimated processing is of a specified type” on column 8, lines 58-68, column 9, lines 1-2.

With respect to Claim 4, Efron meets the limitation “the nature and/or the amount of the estimated processing indicates whether the steganographic signal has undergone unauthorized processing” on column 8, lines 67-68 and on column 9, lines 1-2.

With respect to Claim 5, Efron meets the limitation “a user acquires the steganographic signal after it undergoes the processing; and the nature and/or the amount of the estimated processing indicates whether the acquired steganographic signal closely matches the

Art Unit: 2135

steganographic signal before it undergoes the processing” on column 9, lines 54-68 and on column 10, lines 1-2.

With respect to Claim 6, Efron meets the limitation “providing a message to the user indicating whether the acquired steganographic signal closely matches the steganographic signal before it underwent the processing” on column 10, lines 22-40. The message to the user is disclosed as the printed report in the reference.

With respect to Claim 7, Efron meets the limitation of multi-generational copying on column 7, lines 38-45.

With respect to Claim 8, Efron meets the limitation “the deterioration of the embedded watermark is measured in accordance with a fragility profile of the embedded watermark” on column 8, lines 7-19.

With respect to Claim 11, Efron meets the limitation “the steganographic signal further includes an embedded robust watermark that signals a receiver that the watermark with redundancy is present in the steganographic signal” on column 7, lines 57-66.

With respect to Claim 12, Efron meets the limitation “the steganographic signal comprises at least one of audio and video content” on column 9, lines 47-53.

With respect to Claim 13, Efron meets the limitation “analyzing an intrinsic fragility of the signal, which is a carrier of the watermark layer determining a fragility profile in response to said analyzing step” on column 8, lines 65-68 and column 9, lines 5-10; and “wherein the fragility profile is a model or a function that relates a degradation measure of the watermark layer to a degradation measure of the signal that carries the watermark” on column 8, lines 58-68 and on column 9, lines 1-10. The fragility profile has already been discussed above in the rebuttal to the attorney’s argument for Claim 13.

With respect to Claim 14, Efron meets the limitation “subjecting the steganographic signal to at least one processing step” on column 9, lines 54-68, column 9, lines 1-2; and “wherein the fragility profile denotes a deterioration of the embedded watermark layer due to said at least one processing stage” on column 9, lines 54-68, column 9, lines 1-2.

With respect to Claim 15, Efron meets the limitation “the intrinsic fragility analysis is applied to a cover portion of the signal before the signal is degraded by at least one processing step to indicate whether or not the watermark layer will survive the processing step” on column 9, lines 5-10.

With respect to Claim 16, Efron meets the limitation “increasing a power of the watermark layer in the signal before the signal is degraded by the processing step if the intrinsic fragility analysis indicates that the watermark layer will not survive the processing step” on column 7, lines 11-16 and on column 8, lines 65-67.

With respect to Claim 17, Efron meets the limitation “the intrinsic fragility analysis is applied to a cover portion of the signal to suggest eventual modifications of a configuration a watermarking system used to provide the watermark layer to ensure a survival of the watermark layer through a specified processing stage” on column 8, lines 58-68 and on column 9, lines 1-10.

With respect to Claim 18, Efron meets the limitation of “after the analyzing and determining steps, the signal, and data designating the fragility profile, are distributed to a decoder” on column 31, lines 49-53.

With respect to Claim 19, Efron meets the limitation “the data designating the fragility profile is carried in the signal” on column 9, lines 5-10.

With respect to Claim 20, Efron meets the limitation “the data designating the fragility profile is carried in the signal in another watermark layer” on column 10, lines 10-16.

With respect to Claim 22, Efron meets the limitation “means for embedding a watermark with a degree of redundancy into the signal to form a steganographic signal” on column 7, lines 57-66; and “means for measuring a deterioration of the embedded watermark in the steganographic signal after the steganographic signal undergoes the processing” on column 8,

Art Unit: 2135

lines 20-57 and on column 7, lines 17-25; and “means for estimating the nature and/or the amount of the processing based on the measured deterioration” on column 15, lines 33-44.

With respect to Claim 23, its limitation is similar to Claim 13 limitation and hence its rejection can be found therein.

Claims 9 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Efron (4,755,884) in view of Shimpuku et al (5,432,799).

With respect to Claim 9, all the limitation is met by Efron except the limitation disclosed below.

The limitation “the fragility profile denotes a relationship between a bit error rate of the watermark and a signal to noise ratio of the steganographic signal” is met by Shimpuku et al in the abstract.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Shimpuku et al within the system of Efron so as to be able to modulate the signal.

With respect to Claim 21, all the limitation is met by Efron except the limitation disclosed below.

The limitation of “the fragility profile denotes a relationship between a bit error rate of the watermark layer and a signal to noise ratio of the signal after the watermark layer and the signal are degraded” is met by Shimpuku in the abstract.

Art Unit: 2135

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Shimpuku et al within the system of Efron so as to be able to modulate the signal.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Efron (4,755,884) in view of Smith et al (5,945,932).

With respect to claim 10, all the limitation is met by Efron except the limitation disclosed below.

The limitation of "the watermark is embedded in the signal in accordance with a predicted sensitivity of the signal that is based on a psychoacoustic analysis thereof" is met by Smith et al in the abstract. The psychoacoustic analysis is represented by situation described of a code that has symbols formed from an impulse function having its energy within a specified frequency range, that is inaudible to human perception.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Smith et al within the system of Efron because the art of using the psychoacoustic analysis feature would enable a watermark embedded within an audio stream to be undetectable to the common user. Hence, this feature can be used to store authentication information or other forms of secret data that is to be kept unknown to the user.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tracey Akpati whose telephone number is 571-272-3846. The examiner can normally be reached on 8.30am-6.00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on 571-272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2135

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

OTA



KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100